IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K.DENESAN

MONDAY, THE 12TH MARCH 2007 / 21ST PHALGUNA 1928

WP(C).No. 8253 of 2007(G)

PETITIONER:

MOHAMMED USMAN, 2ND GRADE DRAFTSMAN,
BLOCK DEVELOPMENT OFFICE, MALAPPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.SIBY MATHEW
SRI.PHILIP J.VETTICKATTU

RESPONDENTS:

1. **THE CHIEF ENGINEER,**
   PWD ADMINISTRATION, TRIVANDRUM.

2. **THE BLOCK DEVELOPMENT OFFICER AND**
   SECRETARY, BLOCK DEVELOPMENT OFFICE,
   MALAPPURAM.

3. **SRI.M.P.BALAKRISHNAN,**
   2ND GRADE DRAFTSMAN, N.H.DIVISION,
   MALAPPURAM.

R1 & 2 BY GOVT. PLEADER SHRI.P.NANDAKUMAR.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 12/03/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.K.DENESAN, J.

==========
WP(C).No.8253 OF 2007-G.
==========

Dated this the 12th day of March, 2007.

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner has filed this writ petition challenging Ext.P5 order passed by the Chief Engineer on 8-3-2007. The order involves transfer of the petitioner and the 3rd respondent from one office to another. But both these offices are stationed at Malappuram. The only difference is that one is the Block Development Office and the other is the National Highway Division Office. I do not find any valid reason for the petitioner to feel aggrieved.

2. Ext.P5 will not cause any inconvenience or hardship to the petitioner. This Court or for that matter any other competent Court or authority need examine the legality of a transfer order only if the person who complaints against that order is shown to suffer any inconvenience or hardship as a result of the implementation of the transfer order. I am of the

opinion that the petitioner cannot be said to be a person aggrieved. This writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

K.K.DENESAN, JUDGE.

kvs/-